DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 640 EA 004 248

AUTHOR Coughlan, Robert J.; Zaltman, Gerald
TITLE Implementing the Change Team Concept.
PUB DATE 7 Apr 72
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (57th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; Educational Change; Educational Research; Group Dynamics; *Innovation; *Management Education; *Organizational Change; Planning; Recruitment; School Organization; Speeches; *Team Training; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on variables to be considered in implementing the team approach to planned change in educational organizations. The first part deals with team considerations -- recruitment and selection, composition, training, and future roles of members in the client system. The second section presents various strategies and tactics for institutionalizing the change agent team as an integral part of school system operations. A related document is EA 004 247. (Author)

ED 061640

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

N-A1
EA

Northwestern University
School of Education
Graduate School of Management
Evanston, Illinois

Annual Meeting

of the

American Educational Research Association

Symposium
on

CHANGE PROCESS IN EDUCATION
SOME FUNCTIONAL AND STRUCTURAL IMPLICATIONS

Chicago, Illinois
April 7, 1972

Implementing the Change Team Concept

by

Robert J. Coughlan
School of Education

and

Gerald Zaltman
Department of Marketing
Graduate School of Management

EA 004 248

IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGE TEAM CONCEPT

This paper focuses on variables to be considered in implementing the team approach to planned change in educational organizations. It consists of two main sections. The first deals with team considerations: recruitment and selection, composition, training, and future roles of members in the client system. The second section presents various strategies and tactics for institutionalizing the change agent team as an integral part of school system operations.

TEAM CONSIDERATIONS

Our approach attempts to fuse aspects of individual personality, group functioning, and organizational contexts in the formation of a change team. We trace some of the possible configurations teams can take in terms of these three levels of analysis. The central thesis of this perspective is that program planners have options regarding the development of change teams. We believe that their choices should be guided by the requirements of individual, group, and contextual variables in interaction. Thus, different patterns in recruitment and selection, team composition, role taking, and training are appropriate insofar as these elements vary in their importance in a given situation. To our way of thinking, no sound case can be made for the inherent superiority of any one team approach over others except as it better meets the demands of the total situation: of the people involved, their functioning as members of a group, and the formal organization and societal environment in which they operate.

---

[1] We would like to thank Allan M. Mohrman for his assistance in the preparation of this paper.

Personality Considerations

The traits and characteristics of individuals are key variables to be considered in the development of change teams. Individual behavior in a change team is predicated partly on personal skill (mental ability, aptitudes, education, training, experience, knowledge, judgment) and will (work habits, character traits, attitudes, motivations, drive, emotional maturity, temperament). Personal efficiency and effectiveness are functions of complex interactions among and between these traits and the feedback, incentive, and reward systems provided by the change team and its parent educational organization.

This perspective suggests a multivariate approach to the analysis of criterion and predictor variables relevant in team recruitment, selection, and training. Under what circumstances are which traits most highly associated with effective performance in dealing with specific change problems in what kinds of client systems? Our review of the trait literature (Stogdill, in press) revealed few useful studies for guiding our thinking with respect to this question. For this reason, we will have little to say about aspects of personality in the contexts in which change teams may operate. The few points we do make on the subject are, however, suggestive of the kinds of supportive research and experimentation required for successfully implementing the change team concept in ongoing organizations.

Group Considerations

A change agent team is fundamentally a small human group. In considering the development of change teams, we relied heavily on a paradigm of group formation proposed by Mills (1967, pp. 101-118). While this model is most meaning-

ful when applied to naturally occurring groups, we can assume that the voluntary recruitment of persons into change teams is functionally equivalent to voluntary formation of a group.

The Mills' paradigm is based on five cumulative "orders of purpose" through which a group progresses in its social-emotional and task development. The first order is concerned with the immediate gratification of the personal and social needs of members obtained through interaction (see Table 1). The second is concerned with sustaining contact among members so that relationships may continue. The third order involves the pursuit of a collective goal. The fourth order of purpose is self-determination for the group. Here the group has achieved the maturity and "consciousness" which allow members to establish conditions necessary to set and pursue their own goals free from external restraints, past practices, and prior commitments. The fifth order concerns the group's growth in capabilitites and influence. This includes becoming "open to wider varieties of information; capable of pursuing a wider range of goals; versatile in producing new ideas, knowledge, and techniques of value both to the group and to others; and increasingly effective in exchanging things of value with others (Mills, p.103)."

The achievement of these five purposes requires a complex and interdependent set of operations and arrangements. Immediate gratification depends on the initial commitment of group members. Sustaining conditions for gratification requires the submission of each member to the central normative demands of the group. Pursuit of a collective goal depends on the ability of members to displace immediate personal gratifications by working toward shared group goals with some confidence that they can be reached. Group self-determination requires self-awareness which includes the ability of members to face the prospect of changing

TABLE I
GROUP PURPOSES, SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS, AND CRITICAL ISSUES [1]

Order of Purpose	Feedback and Knowledge Requirements	Group Role-Systems	Role of Individuals w/in group	Critical Group Organizational Problems
1. Immediate gratification 2. Sustaining conditions of immediate gratification	-knowledge of change-team concept and future roles w/in team and w/in client system. -knowledge of requirements to be met in becoming member of team. -initial orientation meetings with other group members.	normative	normative	-individual must make <u>commitment</u> (thru application). -individual must submit to authority of the group
3. Pursuit of team goal	-acquiring the necessary expertise. -learning the necessary skills involved in the process of organizational change.	technical structure coordinating skills of individual	instrumental performing skills relative to individual expertise	-setting aside immediate gratification. -reasonable confidence that goals can be achieved.
4. Team self-determination	-knowledge of internal group interaction processes. -knowledge of team situation within client system broader environment and <u>all</u> intergroup obligations. -conscious knowledge of all elements in orders of purpose 1,2, and 3.	executive	executive	integrity needed for: -self-awareness -ability to face changing group goals.
5. Team growth	-<u>continuing</u> ties to external environment both within and without client system. -recurring knowledge and information links.	intergroup executive	generative	interchange with other groups.

[1] Adapted from Mills, p. 104.

group goals. Growth requires interchange with other groups. In this formulation a group's progression from one order of purpose to the next is not automatic "but instead occurs through the vision and effort of group members. It is a bootstrap operation that must be imagined and engineered (Mills, p. 105)."

Contextual Considerations

We assume that there is no one "best" personality pattern for membership in a change team nor is there one "best" change team configuration. Recruitment, selection, composition, and training in a change team also are dependent on organizational and societal factors. We have borrowed McCarty and Ramsey's (1968) four descriptions of community power, school board functioning, and role of the superintendent as a useful typology in analyzing possible school system contexts. In this model, community decision making is related to Board operations and the role of the superintendent. McCarty and Ramsey portray four situations: dominated, factional, pluralistic, and inert.

> In the dominated context, a single cohesive leadership group in the community directs the course of events on major policy issues. Board members "take the advice" of community leaders or may actually share their dominant ideology. Decisions are consistently guided in board meetings by members in the "right direction." The superintendent in this type system identifies with the community leaders. He carries out their policy rather than sharing in its development. He serves solely as a functionary.

> In the factional context, at least two durable community factions compete for power and leadership on major school issues. Board members represent these factional viewpoints in meetings. Voting on issues often is more important than concession-making and compromise; the majority faction wins. The balance in decision making shifts as new members are elected to the board. The superintendent identifies with the faction in power but also keeps in touch with opposing groups. Acting as a political strategist, he takes a middle course, shifting his behavior with changes in the power balance.

In the pluralistic context, the community power structure is diffused. There are many contenders for leadership which varies with each major school issue. Board members represent interests but are not rigidly bound to one position. Discussion of problems is directed toward consensus which reflects personal detachment from special interests. The superintendent is not forced to identify with the ideology of any particular interest group nor to carry out "handed down" policy. He is expected to give professional advice on school issues based on his expertise, experience, and research findings.

In the inert context, the community exerts no active power or influence regarding school matters. Board members perform perfunctorily because they lack ideologies and constituents who stand for one viewpoint or another. They follow the lead of the superintendent and validate his policy. In this situation the superintendent acts as a decision maker. He is free to initiate action in both administrative and substantive areas. The board serves as a "rubber stamp" in approving his recommendations.

Recruitment and Selection of Team Members

It is of utmost importance that the client system be fully committed to the team approach to change and take active part in delineating the criteria and patterns on which recruitment and selection are based (see Radnor and Coughlan). This would also include specifiying the formal organizational roles that team members will play and the relation of the team to other divisions and departments within the system.

School systems with limited financial resources and/or those located in communities which decry the "endless proliferation" of staff specialists might consider implementing the change team on a part-time basis. Members would spend a portion of their energies on other duties within the system or in other sectors of the community. The intergroup ties which would result from this arrangement may in fact permit the change team to achieve greater effectiveness. Large school systems might consider employing a full-time team or two or three coordinated part-time teams.

Employment for a reasonable period of time after training of the team must be guaranteed to all its members. The team should not be required to work on a short-term provisional or other insecure basis (Bennis and Schein, p.356). Likewise the client system should not have to fear excessive team turnover due to the increased mobility of members associated with higher levels of education. A three to five year contract spelling out the mutual obligations of team members and the employing school district seems highly appropriate.

The motives and goals of individuals seeking membership in a change team will vary. This implies that information about team opportunities should be widespread and well understood by people in those organizations and communities from which members are to be recruited. Different appeals and recruitment strategies seem appropriate to attract a mix of applicants whose personal interests, needs, and skills are required for effective team composition (more about this point later).

Some applicants will be attracted on the basis of work interests; others because of strong economic, recognition, achievement, or service needs. As a consequence, candidates may be prepared to give qualitatively different kinds of commitment and submit to the group's authority in different ways. Initial commitment comes about as the candidates perceive the change team as a way of furthering their personal motives and goals.

Team recruitment is also partly a function of the client system and its societal context. These dimensions suggest a number of possibilities. For example, the recruitment pattern may be based on a diagonal slice through the system: administrator, principal, supervisor, teacher, and counselor. This arrangement might be designed partly to improve the flow of information from all levels and locations

within a district. Such a pattern may be appropriate for dominated and sanctioning contexts where there is a strong need to increase the quantity and quality of communication throughout existing strong and stable bureaucratic structures.

A variation in the recruitment pattern might also focus on a particular interface viewed as important in a client system, e.g., a board-administrator/teacher discontinuity. In this case, a change team might be composed of teachers, board members, central office, and middle-echelon administrators. This arrangement may be particularly relevant to those school systems that have no formal teacher collective negotiations with the school board. It would represent an attempt to deal in part with those problems and issues covered by collective agreements. Such conditions may prevail most frequently in the dominated and inert contexts.

In the pluralistic context various community organizations may be interacting frequently with the school system on educational matters. A change team in this circumstance might reflect an interface between outside organizations and the school system. Thus, members of the PTA, community pressure groups, and line and staff representatives from the school system might form a team. As in the model discussed above, this type of arrangement could represent a form of cooptation (Selznick, 1953, p. 13) in that it attempts to institutionalize outside forces and focus change efforts at those points where the pressures are greatest. In formalizing such arrangements care must be taken to evaluate whether the stresses and cleavages present are so great as to make productive intergroup relationships impossible (Benne and Birnbaum, p. 328). This cautionary rule of thumb would seem to apply to any proposed pattern of recruitment.

In a different context, Havelock (p. 7-39) reminds us to look for "linking agents" for change in prospectively abundant but relatively untapped human resource sectors. This suggestion leads to a possible pattern of recruitment geared to

draw on the contribution of teachers locked into but not fulfilled by the demands of their present positions or housewives faced with a similar situation at home. The use of citizen participation in change teams provides an especially large, variegated, and talented pool of candidates, especially if the positions to be filled are on a part-time basis.

A recruitment pattern might also be based on the use of already formed groups within the school system. Building on existing relationships would overcome some of the problems of introducing a change agent team into the system. As an example of this arrangement, a team could be recruited from existing citizen advisory or teacher groups operating under the direction of the school board or administration. In these instances, however, an important consideration bears on the voluntary nature of the commitment to membership in a change team. Applications from an existing group should be reviewed with particular emphasis on evaluating the extent of interest and commitment on the part of all its members. Voluntariness of commitment for this particular assignment probably should not be sacrificed for other values.

Another recruitment pattern could be based on the notion of using the change team as a vehicle for "protest absorption" as discussed by Leeds (p. 201). This would involve utilizing an existing "non-conforming enclave" within the client system. This group would then have an increased potential to effect changes which it deems important. Like cooptation, protest absorption is a risky business. Moreover, it could well distort the concept of the change team that is being considered. Yet this type of arrangement might be appropriate for certain pluralistic contexts where groups representing other special interests can provide necessary countervailing checks and balances.

The above-suggested possibilities are not exhaustive; many combinations or

patterns are theoretically possible. From a practical viewpoint, recruitment and selection on the basis of ascribed status, e.g., age, sex, race, and ethnicity, may eventually loom large in the process. The point to be emphasized here, however, is that the criteria for recruitment and selection should not be decided arbitrarily but should fit with the total situation in which the change team must operate.

Decisions regarding the numerical size of the team depend in part on the resources and requirements of the client system to be served: manpower, money, and time. They also would be contingent on the internal dynamics and decision making patterns in the group. Five is perhaps the optimal number of members for a change team not only in terms of interaction (Berelson and Steiner, p. 310), but also in terms of functional specialisms to be performed (these will be delineated later). Since even numbered groups are prone to deadlock in decision making, under certain conditions seven or nine members also may be feasible alternatives.

Team Composition and Roles

Mills' first and second orders of group purpose call for the immediate gratification of the personal and social needs of the individuals involved and the subsequent decision of members to sustain those conditions which provided initial gratification. Unless specifically planned, opportunities for gratifying needs on the basis of social exchanges may not be possible in the early stages of team development. An orientation program and activities therefore should be designed in part ot increase face-to-face contacts among members which are conducive to group social-emotional development. These sessions would lay the groundwork for establishing behavioral patterns and norms within the group which are necessary for sustaining those conditions on which future task endeavors will be based.

With respect to group composition, we can now begin considering group functioning and individual specialization beyond the roles enacted by members prior to their recruitment. Composition, in this enlarged sense, not only includes the array of personalities and talents of members resulting from selection. It also encompasses the status and role system which will emerge within the team through planning as well as through informal interaction. This role system is partly a product of individual characteristics and, in the early stages of group development, of previous role enactment by members prior to joining the team. Beyond the normative authority patterns emerging from informal interaction, team composition will be related to choices made by members at the third order of purpose.

The third order of purpose deals with the group's beginning to formulate and pursue a collective goal. To reach this purpose, the roles of group members now must become instrumental and the resulting role system within the team technically oriented toward a collective goal. In a change team, the broad goal is one of effecting desired changes within the client system. The roles of team members should therefore become instrumental in achieving that goal.

Team composition must now be defined in terms of those key functions and technical skills associated with the change process. Five such functions may be delineated: identifying and diagnosing organization problems and needs; developing change strategies; implementing strategies in the ongoing organization; evaluating results; and disseminating and utilizing outcomes. Other conceptualizations of change implementation may tend to differentiate roles along other lines of technical competence and expertise.

The interest and skill distribution among individuals required to carry out team functions should play a major role in the recruitment and selection process.

If left to chance, a team conceivably might be formed around a number of persons who have similar interests, aptitudes, and skills in one or more functional areas to the exclusion of others. This imbalance would present particular problems in those cases where an existing group is recruited for training. The probability is relatively low that an intact group would be composed of diverse individuals sufficiently able and willing to assume the array of functions that an effective change team might be required to perform.

Once the team's technical role system is delineated, the group is ready to ascend toward Mills' fourth order of purpose: self-determination. Here members are required to free themselves from past constraints, routines, and traditions. By gaining access to information about themselves through awareness of inter-member relations and obligations, the team has acquired a consciousness which allows it to accomplish this broad purpose. By accomplishing this purpose, the change team can begin assuming an "executive" role. At this stage, members now are able to transcend both conceptually and emotionally the demands of their immediate situation. It is this widening of perspective that allows a team to act as a source of change. The consciousness of members concerning their environmental context provides a crucial link between the team itself, the client system in which it is imbedded, and the outside world.

Providing a broadened perspective to the change team has additional implications for team composition. The recruitment and selection pattern can be designed to insure a wide range of previous role experience --cosmopolitanism-- on the part of prospective members. To further strengthen diversity, each team member might also be selected on the basis of previous background and training in management or the social and behavioral sciences. This mix of skills would provide an added interdisciplinary perspective to the change process.

Many analysts maintain that the major impetus for innovation and change in schools originates outside the formal organization. How then can change emanate from an internal change team? One clue may be found in the roles assumed by members and the training provided change teams as they enter into Mills' fifth order of purpose: group growth.

We have seen that a team capable of self-determination has developed an expanded consciousness of itself operating within its total environment. This consciousness functions as a necessary link with the cutside world. But the perspectives afforded by awaremess are static unless and until forces from outside the team are reflected within the group. These forces become operative when the group enters the fifth order purpose.

Growth is conceived by Mills in terms of increasing team capabilities, influence, and openness to ranges of available information. This growth requires, as a critical input, consciously created interchanges with other groups both within and outside the client system. These contacts serve as part of the development of the team's executive function at the intergroup level. The composition of the team as members strive to accomplish this purpose may be related to the ties which members have with other subsystems or groups. For example, one team member may act as a link between the team and the district administration; another between the team and teachers or between the team and supervisory personnel. Still another member may serve as the link with an important community group. The accomplishment of group growth depends on the team's ability to construct these necessary intergroup linkages.

In Mills' paradigm a change team can assume an executive role which in turn (we hypothesize) will equip it to become a source of change. The question may be asked: why can't individual executives already within a school system serve as active sources of change? Mills contends that individual executive consciousness

and self-determination are never possible. In effect, because of sheer physical limitations, organizational complexity tends to swamp and overwhelm the individual. As a result, the executive tends to slip into pseudo-executive postures which are marked by manipulation, obstructionism, simplification, suppression, and/or self-delusion (Mills, pp. 99-100).

The organizational dilemma of complexity and confusion is exemplified in a theoretical analysis of the forces which constitute the problems of educational administration as explicated by Schwab (1964). In analyzing the multitude of factors impinging on administrative decision making, he concluded:

> "Since we have dealt with, so far, only with the sources or loci of educational problems and have taken no account whatever of the variety of criteria by which solutions to these problems may be judged good or bad, nor any account of the numerous factors constituting the behaviors of administrators in attempting to solve these problems, it is amply clear that the number of factors involved is vastly greater than 4,500, for these further factors will enter into our equation, not as additions, but as multipliers. Let us settle for an estimate of 50,000." (p.54).

In a real sense, the change team represents an attempt to position within the client system the added resources of a trained group dedicated to the performance of this executive function.

Group Authority Structure

As the technical role system in the team develops, certain authority configurations will begin to emerge. These structures in turn may be related to the societal context and client system within which the group operates. In an analysis of authority structures in team teaching, Lortie (1962) discussed vertical-bureaucratic vs. horizontal-collegial arrangements and their impact on teacher rewards and careers.

We chose Lortie's constructs as ways of analyzing possible authority structures in team formation. We assume that these arrangements are poles of an ideal-type continuum along which various team authority structures will fall,

The vertical-bureaucratic structure parallels the formal organization of the school system and as such has many of its essential characteristics. In this arrangement a group member is formally appointed as head or leader of the team. He serves as a focal point for team activities.

The vertical-bureaucratic structure is characterized by subordination of status of team members and tendencies toward increased specialization and routinization of team tasks. The leader is in a position to control group goal formulation and regulate individual levels of subordinate effort and output. His higher ascribed status enables him to obtain greater deference and respect than his colleagues from individuals and collectivities outside the team. Such an arrangement may lead to increased internal team coordination but at the expense of reducing the range of contacts between team members and others in the organizational context. The emphasis on rank differences and centralized decision making may also prove to be unsatisfying to the more active and independent members of a given team.

A change team may also be organized along horizontal-collegial authority lines. In this situation the group rules its affairs essentially by internal democratic procedures. This formation is based on equality among members as well as on close working relationships. Team leadership is regarded as a function of the needs and problems faced by the group at a particular time. As such it is rotated among members as external and internal circumstances change. Norms and rules of operation govern the team's relations with individuals and collectivities outside the team. Problems may be created when outsiders show greater deference and respect to some team members than others. With respect

to individual effort and output, slackers and eager beavers would be disciplined by the group's culture and norms.

A superintendent carrying out board policy in a dominated context may tend to dictate tasks to be accomplished by a change team, e.g., install a new learning technology into the school system. In this case the team in effect would become a functionary of the superintendent. Responsibility for success or failure created by the functionary role may bring about vertical-bureaucratic authority arrangements within the change team. Such a structure may be efficient if we can assume that all changes effected by the team originate at a source superordinate to the team itself. Change implementation in this arrangement may gradually become routinized and standardized. In this case, serious questions may be raised whether the approach could be effective in the long run and whether the team is actually functioning in a change agent role.

If the superintendent functions as a decision maker or a professional advisor, as in the inert and pluralistic contexts, respectively, the change team may also be able to function in similar modes. The authority structure most appropriate for these operations may be the horizontal-collegial. The impetus for change in this case can be seen as originating within the change team as well as from sources elsewhere in the school system and its environment.

In the factional context, where the superintendent operates as a political strategist, strong ties between the change team and particular interest groups may emerge. It is not unlikely that issues impinging on matters of change could become partisan within the team itself as they do within factional school boards. The authority structure within the team therefore may become differentiated along political rather than collegial or hierarchical lines. If linkages take the form of mutual influence between the team and various community factions, the group's authority structure might then assume a more collegial posture.

Pressures for change in dominated and factional contexts tend to flow from the community environment into the school system. It would therefore seem necessary that strong intergroup ties be constructed between community forces and the change team. If many team members have community ties the team may be expected to assume a horizontal-collegial authority structure. However if only one member is strongly connected with influentials outside the client system, then a vertical-hierarchical authority system in the group may result. If all members are recruited from within the client system and no community linkages are constructed, then group growth may be severely restricted and the ability of the team to act as a source of change radically truncated. The team may, in effect, never attain Mills' fifth order of purpose, i.e., group growth.

Failure to establish linkages with a number of community factions may also reduce the change team to the position where it is constrained to respond to pressures from the dominant faction as these are relayed through the superintendent. In such circumstances the team might regress to Mills' third order of purpose where team composition is reduced to in-fighting over technical and instrumental roles. As was the case within a dominated context, the resultant authority structure would probably tend toward the vertical-hierarchical end of the continuum.

Finally, if the change team has the horizontal-collegial structure, the question of payment of services may be important. Equal inputs of members into team output should be rewarded equally. If the team members operate on a part-time basis, discrepancy in pay based on work done outside the team will probably not affect performance since direct comparison of inputs and outputs is not likely. If there is a discrepancy in payments to members exclusively for change team work, an adjustment in input level by the various members might occur (Goodman and Friedman, p. 271). Differentials in monetary rewards are likely to create an ineffectual change team and/or a vertical-bureaucratic

structure within it.

Team Training

For group members to function as a change team, certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes must be acquired. We suggest that training scope, content, and sequence might be geared rather closely to Mills' orders of purpose as a way of establishing the foundations upon which the team will function. Learning experiences in this training model would be based on the types of interaction and feedback necessary for the group to move successfully through each order in accomplishing its overall aims.

As discussed earlier, immediately following initial commitment it becomes necessary to ascertain whether the individuals assigned to a particular team will be willing to submit to its developing norms and standards. Team members should be brought together in orientation sessions to become acquainted and to establish more clearly the relationship between individual motives and goals and proposed team objectives. On the basis of interaction and feedback gained in these sessions, some individuals may opt out of the team.

In order to pursue a collective goal, team composition must reflect the technical role system required to effect change. This calls for training in those skills necessary for each member to specialize in the performance of an instrumental role. Training in specific skills--in problem identification and diagnosis, strategy formulation, change implementation, evaluation of results, and knowledge dissemination and utilization--would involve three elements. These include (1) a thorough understanding of the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of the skill, (2) incorporation of appropriate skills through clinical and simulated practice, and (3) an understanding of the entire change process so that functional relationships

among all skill areas are understood and integrated.

In order to operate effectively at the level of team self-determination, members must gain knowledge of internal group processes and intergroup relations both within the client system and the surrounding societal context. This training lays the necessary groundwork for the group's assumption of the "executive" role. Appropriate learning experiences at this point would be oriented toward the development of group consciousness. This would involve (1) specific instruction in underlying group processes from many perspectives with an emphasis on critically investigating the group's own structure and functioning when problem solving in clinical or simulated situations; (2) extensive cooperative work relationships in situations both similar and dissimilar to those found within the school district to which the team is assigned; and (3) training in education, management, and the social and behavioral sciences which would allow the perspectives gained in (2) above to be analyzed within a comprehensive conceptual framework for change to be developed by the team in the course of its training.

The final stage of training should be designed to stimulate and sustain team growth. In an earlier section, we dealt with the intergroup relations required to foster this stage of development. We were concerned with ties which may exist between the change team and subsystems of the client system or community groups. Formal training and field experiences should be on an ongoing basis in the client system and community to create and foster those intergroup linkages that would establish and maintain conditions for group growth.

In attempting to sustain growth, the change team would place itself in the position of possibly losing its autonomy due to its active search for intergroup ties. This is a risk the group must take. For if the team becomes isolated with-

in the client system due to failure to achieve appropriate linkages, the results will probably be to regress the group to lower order purposes and roles. This threat to group growth implies the need for training in resolving intergroup conflicts such as that developed by Blake (1969). His approach involves each group in conflict separately describing its own image and its image of the other group, reporting each group's image to the other, meeting separately to consider what kinds of behavior on the part of each group may have led to the image which the other group holds, sharing and discussing openly the behavioral hypotheses held by both groups, and meeting together to work toward reducing the discrepancy between self-image and the image held by the other group.

At all stages of training the client system must commit itself to reeducative and consultative interaction with the institution involved in developing the change team. This is an integral part of the training process for it would help prevent the linkage failures discussed above. If several organizations are involved which could affect or be effected by the activities of the change team, they also must be made receptive to the change team concept (Benne and Birnbaum, p. 328).

STRATEGIES OF CHANGE

In this section discussion focuses upon strategies of change which can be used to implement the change team concept. The first topic treated, however, is the nature of the change team concept as an innovation. This is followed by an analysis of major strategy categories. The final section presents a number of factors which influence the actual choice of strategies. Since the person or group concerned with implementing the change team concept may vary we shall generalize and refer to this party as the change agent: it may be the school principal in one case, the school board in another instance, or even a committee of teachers.

In fact one of the most intriguing research problems facing us concerns the question, what is the relevant advocate group? Under what conditions is it likely to be one party or another? The change team itself will be referred to alternately as the innovation, or change team. It might be added that the strategies and related considerations to be mentioned for the change agent are equally relevant to members of the change team. The intended audience (those to whom strategies are directed) for the change team will be referred to as target groups or school systems.

Perhaps the single most important decision a change agent makes in an instance of planned change concerns the strategy or strategies to be pursued in implementing a proposed change. This is no less true when the proposed change itself is the institutionalization of a team of formal change agents where none existed in explicit approved form before. What are some of the types of strategies involved? What conditions relate to these strategies? What decision criteria are involved in selecting strategies? How are strategies put into operation? These are just a few of the many questions one can raise. But first, before any answers or suggestions can be offered it is necessary to know something of the nature of the innovation under consideration. We shall address this problem briefly here.

The Innovation

Various characteristics of innovations have been described by researchers. We shall not attempt to treat all of them here (see Zaltman and Lin, 1971; 1973). Caution is advised in studying the dimensions of innovations, especially in education. Carlson (1968) for example reported on a study in which a panel of educators were asked to rate each of six widespread educational innovations by applying five characteristics to the six innovations. The characteristics were divisibility, communicability, relative advantage, compatibility, and complexity. The result

was little agreement among panel members in their ratings. No concensus was obtained concerning the applicability of these criteria to the innovations. With this caution in mind, we shall proceed to describe what we feel to be some of the major attributes of the change team as an innovation.

The change team concept can be said to be more of a radical solution than a routine solution in that it involves, for the large majority of school organizations, a new structural unit which is charged with a responsibility not previously clearly focused in any existing part of the organization structure. To the extent that responsibility for directed change is diffused throughout the school system then the proposed innovation may appear threatening to many individuals. The concept is wide in scope in that it influences a significant number of tasks within a school system (Wilson 1966). The change team would not limit its activities to any one area such as instruction or teacher evaluation but would range across areas. Moreover, the innovation involves reorientation rather than variation (Normann, 1971), i.e., it involves basic changes such as new goals, values and support structures and requires new kinds of specialist knowledge. The concept has high gateway capacity in that it establishes opportunities for further significant innovations to enter the system (Zaltman and Lin, 1971; 1973). In fact, this feature is the central advantage in the entire argument favoring change teams. It is difficult to determine a priori whether the change team concept will be compatible with the existing system into which it is to be incorporated (Thio, 1971). There will, of course, be a measure of self-selection involved: school systems with which the idea is compatible will probably tend to adopt innovations more rapidly anyway and, to that extent, are in less need of this particular innovation while those systems with which the idea is incompatible will tend to resist the idea and probably other innovative ideas as well. The potential for pervasiveness is high; the concept, if successfully implemented, may require adjustment or change among many

other elements in the social system and perhaps outside, such as parents and developers and suppliers of educational materials. Whether this adjustment will be gradual or immediate depends in part upon the strategies employed by the change agents.

The innovation seems to have relatively little divisibility, i.e., it does not seem to be possible to implement the idea in limited ways which would also permit a fair test of the idea. However, this may be partially a matter of perspective: Viewed from the standpoint of a large educational system it may be tried in one or a few of the school districts, in the fashion of a controlled experiment. However, in the experimental groups it would seem advisable to employ the concept in full measure.

The innovation will clearly have a strong impact on social relationships within the social system where it is tried. The relative impact it has on the socio-emotional functions and the task and goal related functions remains to be seen. Properly introduced, the concept could well lessen tension by providing a sympathetic ear to members of the system who may feel frustrated or blocked in their efforts to change. The impact on social relationships is an important quality of the innovation which must be considered carefully in both the implementation and evaluation phases. For example the change team may provide a closed circuit communication link between the teacher and school principal. Members of the change team would be in direct contact with teachers and principal thus by-passing vice-principals, department chairmen and others. One effect would be to give the teacher a feeling of immediacy with the top decision maker. A dysfunctional effect would be the alienation of those people occupying the role positions which are being by-passed. This need not be the case of course. Change agents could specialize or focus their contacts on a particular groups. Thus one agent becomes the contact person for teachers, another for department chairmen, central administration, etc. so that each

major part of the school system has its representative.

Another attribute of the innovation is that it is very likely to involve a collective rather than individual adoption or rejection decision process. Because of its pervasiveness and impact on social relations a number of persons will probably be involved in the decision making process. But here, again, this is also dependent upon the strategy used to implement the concept. Conceivably the adoption could be brought about by fiat. At the other extreme of the continuum, adoption would be obtained by achieving concensus through group discussions. The latter approach will probably be favored in practice. Related to this is the feature of social system nodes or points where the innovation could be introduced into the system. The idea of a change team could be put forth by anyone ranging from the school board to the individual classroom teacher although it is likely that the champion of the idea will be someone highly placed in the system bureaucracy or someone such as a consultant who is nominally at least outside the system.

Change Strategies

Several typologies of change strategies have been proposed in the last few years. For example, Chin and Benne (1969) have suggested three basic types of strategies: The first type of change strategy is the empirical-rational strategy which assumes rational behavior; if men are shown what is to their best interest they will make the changes needed to achieve that improved condition. Thus if the connection were made between some particular goal or value held by members of the school system and the adoption of the change team, the school system or the important elements within it would presumably accept the team concept as being

to their self-interest. It is important in following this strategy to determine accurately what needs are perceived by the various groups in the school system with regard to programs of change.

Normative-re-educative strategies stress the importance of norms and institutions and internalized values and habits in shaping behavior. Changes are brought about by altering institutions and co-opting target groups in general programs of change. The tactic of actively involving the target group is an important element of this type of strategy. In this instance those concerned with introducing the change team concept would do well to involve early in the planning process persons likely to be most affected by such teams. Thus there should be mutual and collaborative intervention between target group and those instituting the change team concept.

Power-coercive approaches emphasize the use of political, economic or even moral sanctions to induce the desired changes among the target group. The withholding of government funds until particular actions are carried out is not unknown in education. Thus school systems not displaying innovative behavior as evidenced by the acceptance of a change team might have its resources restricted by the apportioning body. Or, conversely, special financial incentives might be provided to those institutions who do adopt the advocated change.

Jones (1965) has developed three basic strategies each with two substrategies. First there are coercive strategies characterized by nonmutual goal-setting and imbalanced power relationships. The first substrategy is that of pressure which involves the use or show of force to induce change. Threatening recalcitrant members of the target group with replacement if resistance is displayed or continued would be an example. The substrategy of stress inducement involves the deliberate disruption of the school system's equilibrium. The advocated change is then introduced during the process of establishing a new equilibrium.

Normative strategies according to Jones involve the manipulation of symbolic

rewards, employment of leaders and the control of symbols. Normative strategies are based upon the internalization of particular goals and compliance with pressures to achieve these goals. This can be brought about by co-optation, i.e., involving members of the target group, particularly its leaders, in the process of planning for change. Thus one suggestion is to select teachers, administrative personnel and consultants to become members of the change team. This is the substrategy of participation. A second substrategy involves education and training. Thus selected members of the target group could be involved in special workshops to train them as auxiliary change agents. This has the advantage of co-optation added to the value of sensitizing members of the educational system to the problems and methods involved in educational change.

A final category suggested by Jones are utilitarian strategies which are "characterized by control over material resources and rewards through the allocation of increased contributions, benefits, and services. These are available to the client system when it performs in a manner prescribed by the agent of change." The substrategy of placement involves among other things putting the right people in strategic positions at the time change is desired. The people most sympathetic or believed to be sympathetic to the change team concept would be, in effect, rewarded for having these inclinations by being placed in positions of influence prior to the actual implementation of the concept. The second substrategy is much more straightforward and socially acceptable; it involves the empirical approach of simply demonstrating that a particular change is in fact of value to the system. This is akin to the empirical-rational strategy of Chin and Benne.

Zaltman et al (1972) present a similar structure of strategies. Power strategies in their terminology are those in which the actual use of or implicit or explicit threat of force is involved. It may involve the de facto imposition

of the change the change agent wants. Thus in its most naked form this strategy could result in the change team being presented as a fiat accompli.

Persuasive strategies, a second category, are those which attempt to bring about change partly through bias in the manner in which a message is structured and presented. Appeals may be emotional or rational and may or may not be based on fact. This would involve carefully managed communication flows and content directed to those affected by the change team. Different kinds of information would be prepared for teachers on the one hand and administrators on the other hand.

Reeducative strategies assume "man is a rational being capable of discerning fact and adjusting his behavior accordingly." Because this may involve the unlearning or at least unfreezing of something prior to the learning of the new attitude or behavior the authors use the term re-educative. This strategy suggests the need or use of an extensive program sensitizing the target system to the need for a special change team even prior to the time at which the possibility of having such a team is made known. The sensitization process would be such that the change team concept would seem to be a rational, logical solution to the needs outlined by the sensitization program.

Finally, Warwick (1973) has identified four forms of intervention which will be mentioned briefly. First is coercion which occurs when one person or group forces another to act or refrain from acting under threat of severe deprivation. Manipulation is a second form which "is a deliberate act of changing either the structure of the alternatives in the environment or personal qualities affecting choice without the knowledge of the person involved." Persuasion involves "interpersonal influence in which one person tries to change the attitude or behavior of another by means of argument, reasoning or, in certain cases, structured listening."

Finally, intervention may be in the form of facilitation which is to increase the ease with which an individual or group can implement their choice or satisfy their desires. Examples of these strategies have already been provided.

Other Dimensions of Strategies

All the strategy types above are strikingly familiar in that they assume the same underlying dimension, the dimension of force. Thus at one end of the continuum we have complete force and at the other end total voluntarism. But there are other dimensions of strategies which while generally ignored in the literature are equally important considerations and interact with the force of power dimension. A few of these will be touched upon here. One dimension is the degree of commitment a strategy requires on the part of the change agent and change target. For example, the greater the degree of commitment a proposed change or innovation requires of school principals, for example, the greater the degree of force necessary by superintendents or by teachers in the case of "bottom-up" change. Also in this instance the greater the intensity with which any given strategy must be pursued.

Another consideration involves the extent to which the object of change is aware of being the change target. Again the more forceful the change strategy the more awareness there will be. However, even when a change can be introduced surrepticiously it is usually desirable to make those affected aware of the change.

Time pressure is another fact. The greater the time constraints faced by the change agents the more likely they are to use the maximum amount of force available to them. In one sense the shorter the time between awareness among system members and implementation the shorter the period during which sources of resistance have a chance to organize. What the optional elapsed time between

awareness and implementation should be is a subject of needed research.

The degree of control a change target has over the process of change is a factor which may influence the choice of strategies and tactics. One decision a change agent has to make concerns the optimal level of client or change target participation in the change process. Client participation is normatively desirable as well as advantageous from a strategic point of view. Determining the level of participation is no easy task however, particularly when client attitudes toward the proposed change are not known or not yet formulated.

The perceived need for change is also a determinant of strategy selection. The greater the client's perceived need for a change and the greater the consensus between change agent and client as to the definition of that need and the appropriate solution or way of satisfying that need the less force is necessary. Note however, that there are two important qualifiers here. First, is consensus in defining the problem and second consensus on the appropriate solution. It is difficult to overestimate the extent to which these two factors may be obstacles.

The degree to which clients are open to alternative strategies is another factor. For example not all members of a given school system will be equally open to change. Some members may be very much in favor of the innovation and, because of opposition among other colleagues, they may desire that force be employed. Thus the use of force is not necessarily something all members would oppose.

The capacity of the School system to accept and sustain a change is another factor. The resources necessary for the continued implementation of change may not be present or available. Or only certain kinds of resources are available thus limiting the range of strategies or tactics to those which require only the available resources. Similarly, change agent resources place a constraint upon

activities. For example if a force approach is followed a monitoring or policing function is usually necessary. This requires personnel and associated resources. If manpower is not available for these purposes then a more voluntary or facilitative approach is required. Thus, concerning the durability of a strategy, we might postulate that under coercion, when the change agent withdraws, the status quo ante will be established; when facilitative strategies are employed the change is much more likely to endure in the absence of change agents.

Comprehensiveness of the change effort is an important issue. The greater the degree of total system change required to implement a given innovation the more likely it is that a force type strategy will be required. The larger the number of elements to be altered in a system the larger the potential sources of opposition or resistance. Also, the greater the coordination necessary among elements of the strategy the more difficult it will be to utilize the strategy effectively. Thus complexity of the strategy becomes an issue.

Factors Affecting Strategies

The particular strategy type or strategy combination selected to implement the change team concept and the particular tacts chosen to implement the strategy will vary according to a number of factors. Some of these are considered below. Each factor also represents a potential source of errors a change agent can make.

1. The situation of the person introducing the innovation is important. His role position will carry with it certain limitations as well as unique advantages for pursuing the concept. These limitations and advantages will be somewhat different in different role situations. A group of teachers may lack the formal power a principal has but may have a better feeling for change needs at the grass roots level in curriculum matters.

2. The personality of the change agent also influences his style (and hence preferred strategies and tactics) as a change agent quite apart from his particular position in the school system. Thus the needs and motivations as well as general behavior patterns of the change agent become an important set of strategy influencing factors.

3. The general climate for change present within the school system is an intangible but important factor. For whatever reasons some systems are more open and organic with regard to change and others more closed with regard to change. Each social system has to be approached somewhat differently.

4. The climate of the school system will be partially influenced by the environment in which it as a social unit must function. Thus public attitudes and expectations as they affect the school social system must also be taken into account.

5. The variety and number of different significant others in the social system is still another factor. The more varied and more numerous the relevant others are the more likely it is that several approaches must be tailored to their different needs, motivations, constraints and resources. The list of potential relevant others may range from federal agencies to school boards to students.

6. Another factor, not unrelated to the others, concerns the perceived nature of the innovation. If the innovation is perceived as highly complex, for instance, then efforts must be mounted to present the idea as being less complex to the extent that in some objective sense it is not as complicated as it is perceived to be.

7. The resources made available to the change agents for the specific task of introducing the change team concept is clearly important. This topic has already been mentioned. The nature of the resources will structure or set limits to the range of strategies and perhaps dictates the actual strategies and tactics.

This is one way others not directly concerned with the implementation of innovations exercise their influence in the change process. By withholding funds but in principle approving an innovation, a school board can effectively reject the changes without being on record as against it.

8. Another consideration concerns the relative importance of the formal as against informal social structure of the school setting. Strategies and tactics appropriate to one structure may not be appropriate to the other. Thus, in addition to considering what is appropriate to which structure it is necessary to ask what dysfunctional consequences there might be for the informal structure, for example, resulting from strategies pursued relative to the formal structure.

9. Another consideration, and perhaps this relates back to the internal climate of the school social system, concerns the trade off between strategies geared to overcome resistance versus those designed to increase driving forces. Strategies designed to combat resistance are not necessarily the same as those intended to overcome indifference or to capitalize on existing favorable inclinations toward the change object.

10. Stiles and Robinson (1973) and others have identified various steps through which educational changes move, e.g., development, diffusion, legitimation, adoption, and adaptation. Each stage may involve different strategies in that they involve different processes and may involve different members of the school system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blake, Robert, Jane Srygley Mouton, Richard L. Sloma
1969 "The Union-Management Intergroup Laboratory: Strategy for Resolving Intergroup Conflict," The Planning of Change, Warren G. Bennies, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin (eds). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Benne, Kenneth D. and Max Birnbaum
1969 "Principles of Changing," The Planning of Change, Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne and Robert Chin (eds.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Berelson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner
1964 Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Carlson, Richard
1968 "Summary and Critique of Educational Diffusion," Research Implications for Educational Diffusion. Michigan Department of Education.

Chin, Robert and Kenneth D. Benne
1969 "General Strategies for Effective Change in Human Systems," Planning for Change, W.G. Bennis, K.D. Benne and R. Chin (eds.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Goodman, Paul S. and Abraham Friedman
1971 "An Examination of Adams' Theory of Inequity," Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (3), September.

Griffiths, Daniel E.
1964 "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," Innovation in Education, Matthew B. Miles (ed.). Teachers College, Columbia University.

Havelock, Ronald G.
Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor; Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research.

Jones, Garth
1972 "Strategies and Tactics of Planned Organizational Change," Creating Social Change, G. Zaltman, P. Kotler, L. Kaufman (eds.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Leeds, Ruth
1969 "The Absorption of Protest: A Working Paper," in The Planning of Change, Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, Robert Chin. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont'd.)

Lortie, Dan C.
1964 "The Teacher and Team Teaching: Suggestions for Long-Range Research," Team Teaching, Judson T. Shaplin and Henry F. Olds, Jr. (eds.). Harper and Row.

McCarty, Donald J. and Charles E. Ramsey
1968 "Community Power, School Board Structure, and the Role of the Chief School Administrator," Educational Administration Quarterly, 4, Spring.

Miles, Matthew B.
1964 "On Temporary Systems," Innovation in Education, Matthew B. Miles (ed.). Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mills, Theodore M.
1967 The Sociology of Small Groups. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Norman, R.
1971 "Organizational Innovativeness: Product Variation and Reorientation," Administrative Science Quarterly, 15 (1), March.

Schwab, Joseph J.
1964 "The Professorhship in Educational Administration: Theory - Art - Practice," The Professorship in Educational Administration, Donald Wilson and Jack Culbertson (eds.). Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration.

Selznick, Philip
1953 TVA and the Grass Roots. Los Angeles: University of California.

Stiles, Lindley and Beecham Robinson
1973 "Change in Education," Perspectives on Social Change, Richard Schwartz and Gerald Zaltman (eds.). Wiley Interscience.

Stogdill, Ralph M.
"The Trait Approach to the Study of Leadership." (in press).

Warwick, Donald and Herbert Kelman
1973 "The Ethics of Intervention," Perspectives on Social Change, Richard Schwartz and Gerald Zaltman (eds.). Wiley Interscience.

Wilson, J. Q.
1966 "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory," Approaches to Organizational Design, J. T. Thompson (ed.). University of Pittsburgh Press.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (cont'd.)

Zaltman, Gerald and Nan Lin
1971 "On the Nature of Innovations," American Behavioral Scientist, 14 (5), May/June.

Zaltman, Gerald, Philip Kotler, Ira Kaufman
1972 Creating Social Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.